

10/768,431

LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 10 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-13, 16-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,266,514 issued to O'Donnell on July 24, 2001 in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,308,071 issued to Kalev on October 23, 2001.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of Kalev, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 20050119013 Issued to Jeong et al. dated June 2, 2005.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of Kalev, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,233,448 issued to Alperovich et al. on May 15, 2001.

Rejection Under O'Donnell and Kalev

Claims 1-13, 16-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of Kalev.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants' claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"a network component that employs a) one or more call characteristics to make a determination to initiate a request for one or more positions of one or more mobile stations and b) one or more call parameters to identify one or more cellular network cells associated with the one or more mobile stations, wherein at least one of the one or more call parameters is a telephony number of the one or more mobile stations;
and

wherein the network component receives, in response to the request, the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations from a position component; and

wherein the position component determines the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously".

10/768,431

IUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

As stated in the Office Action, O'Donnell does not teach or suggest "a network component that employs one or more call parameters to identify one or more cellular network cells associated with the one or more mobile stations".

Applicants agree that Kalev teaches a network component that employs one or more one or more call parameters to identify one or more cellular network cells. However, Kalev, similar to O'Donnell, does not teach or suggest the additional limitations of applicants' claim 1. This is because Kalev discloses a location area code (LAC) and a cell identity (CI) associated with cells having a high traffic concentration, i.e., hot spots. As known by those skilled in the art, the LAC may range from 0 to 65,535 and identifies a location area, i.e., number of cells, within a Public Land Mobile Network. Also, the cell identity is a 16 bit identifier used in GSM networks.

By contrast, applicants' claim 1 recites "wherein at least one of the one or more call parameters is a telephony number of the one or more mobile stations". Thus, Kalev is missing the "at least one of the one or more call parameters is a telephony number of the one or more mobile stations" elements of applicants' claim 1.

Therefore the proposed combination of O'Donnell with Kalev does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-13, 16-17 and 22-23 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 18 and 21 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the proposed combination. For example, claims 18 and 21 recite, "wherein at least one of the one or more call parameters is a telephony number of the one or more mobile stations. The proposed combination of O'Donnell and Kalev does not teach or suggest these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 18 and 21 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 19-20 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims are also allowable over O'Donnell.

10/768,431

LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

Rejections Under O'Donnell, Kalev, Jeong and Alperovich

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of Kalev, and further in view of Jeong.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of Kalev, and further in view of Alperovich.

Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under O'Donnell and Kalev being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein at least one of the one or more call parameters is a telephony number of the one or more mobile stations", as recited in applicants' independent claim 1, the combination of O'Donnell with Kalev, Jeong and Alperovich does not supply this missing element. Thus, this combination does not make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

Claim Amendments

Claims 3-5, 7, 9 and 11-16 were amended to add the term "and". No new matter was added.

10/768,431

LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 10 2007

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicants' attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26784

Dated: July 10, 2007

PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA, LLC
Customer Number 47382